



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,982	10/11/2001	Kenneth Ray Banning	AUS920010691US1	8110

44994 7590 12/21/2004

IBM CORPORATION (DWL)  
C/O LALLY & LALLY, L.L.P.  
P. O. BOX 684749  
AUSTIN, TX 78768-4749

EXAMINER

LESNIEWSKI, VICTOR D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/974,982		BANNING ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Victor Lesniewski		2155	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This application has been examined.
2. Claims 1-27 are now pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Hoff (U.S. Patent Number 6,381,631) in view of Fernandez et al., "An Abstract Authorization System for the Internet," hereinafter referred to as Fernandez.

5. van Hoff disclosed a method for allowing a user to access information on a remote network and on third party networks that he has permission to access. In an analogous art, Fernandez disclosed an authorization model for hypertext documents that allows implementation of role-based access control.

6. Concerning claims 1, 10, and 19, van Hoff did not explicitly state that his system initially determines whether the requested document is context restricted and did not explicitly state the ability to return differing versions to the client. However, Fernandez describes in detail the process by which authorization rules are set up for a file access system, thus explicitly showing how a determination is made as to whether a requested document is context restricted.

Furthermore, Fernandez's system explicitly states the use of versioning whereby different levels

Art Unit: 2155

of access may result in the return of different versions to the user. Since the inventions encompass the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of van Hoff by adding the ability to determine whether the requested document is context restricted and the ability to return differing versions to the client as provided by Fernandez. Here, the combination satisfies the need for more advanced authorization policies that can be used to restrict access to documents based on a wider array of concepts or roles. See Fernandez, section 1, paragraph 2. This rationale also applies to those dependent claims utilizing the same combination.

7. Some claims will be discussed together. Those claims which are essentially the same except that they set forth the claimed invention as a computer program product or a server are rejected under the same rationale applied to the described claim.

8. Thereby, the combination of van Hoff and Fernandez discloses:

- <Claims 1, 10, and 19>

A method of processing a client request for a document from a server in a data processing network, comprising: determining whether the requested document is context restricted (Fernandez, section 4.1); responsive to determining that the requested document is context restricted, determining whether the client has access authority to the requested document (van Hoff, column 5, lines 5-28 and column 6, lines 7-17); and responsive to determining that the client lacks access authority, responding to the client request by returning a version of the requested document that differs from a version returned to a client having access authority (Fernandez, section 3, paragraph 3 "This object model...").

Art Unit: 2155

- <Claims 2, 11, and 20>

The method of claim 1, wherein determining whether the client has access authority includes determining whether the client has direct access authority (van Hoff, column 6, lines 25-30).

- <Claims 3, 12, and 21>

The method of claim 2, wherein the client request comprises an HTTP formatted request and further wherein determining whether the client has direct access authority includes comparing state information contained in the request to a predetermined value (van Hoff, column 6, lines 42-53).

- <Claims 4, 13, and 22>

The method of claim 3, wherein the state information required to acquire direct access authority is sent to the client when the client views a document or set of documents that provide the required context for the requested document (van Hoff, column 6, lines 31-41).

- <Claims 5, 14, and 23>

The method of claim 1, wherein determining whether the client has access authority includes determining whether the client has indirect access authority (van Hoff, column 8, lines 34-40).

- <Claims 6, 15, and 24>

The method of claim 5, wherein the client request comprises an HTTP formatted request and further wherein determining whether the client has indirect access authority includes

Art Unit: 2155

determining whether the client has been referred to the requested document by a third party server (van Hoff, column 8, lines 40-48).

- <Claims 7, 16, and 25>

The method of claim 6, wherein determining whether the client has been referred by a third party server comprises determining whether the value of a request header field in the client request matches at least one entry in a table of authorized referrers (van Hoff, column 8, lines 49-56).

- <Claims 8, 17, and 26>

The method of claim 7, wherein the request header field comprises a referrer header field of an HTTP request and wherein the table of authorized referrers is stored permanent storage to which the server has access (van Hoff, column 8, line 65 through column 9, line 1).

- <Claims 9, 18, and 27>

The method of claim 1, wherein returning a version of the requested document that differs includes retrieving the requested document and running an application to insert a visibly detectable notice indicating that the requested document is being viewed out of context (Fernandez, section 5, paragraphs 3 and 4 “Each web server...by extending its authorization system”).

Since the combination of van Hoff and Fernandez discloses all of the above limitations, claims 1-27 are rejected.

*Conclusion*

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

- Liu et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,898,780) disclosed a method for allowing a user to access the Internet from a remote location by using a local Internet service provider with whom the user does not have an account.
- Vahalia et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,192,408) disclosed a network file server with functionality to receive requests from clients and access read-write file systems.
- Sampson et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,339,423) disclosed an access control system that manages access by users to resources in multiple domains.
- Hunt et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,496,855) disclosed a website registration proxy system that allows users to move between registered sites via a single interface.
- Shim, Won Bo; and Park, Seog, "Implementing Web Access Control System for the Multiple Web Servers in the Same Domain Using RBAC Concept" disclosed a distributed web server based system that utilizes a role based access control method.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor Lesniewski whose telephone number is 571-272-3987.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Victor Lesniewski  
Patent Examiner  
Group Art Unit 2155



**HOSAIN ALAM**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**